



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/050,113	03/30/1998	ТАІЛ ЕМА	980446	6454
38834 75	90 08/05/2004		EXAMINER	
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP			WARREN, MATTHEW E	
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW SUITE 700		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20036		2815	

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Applicant(s)

Advisory Action	09/050,113	EMA, TAIJI				
/ Navious / Navious	Examiner	Art Unit				
•	Matthew E Warren	2815				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 20 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a sinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 7 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any arned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.			
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	etion(s):					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely file	d amendment			
5.☑ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does No	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1,4,12 and 14</u> .						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 2,3 and 5-8.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·				
 10.						

Application No.

alla 💯 🗮

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments are not persuasive. The applicant argues that Hosotani et al. and Kimura do not show the limitation of the sidewall insulation film formed on an inner wall of the contact hole and surrounding the contact hole. The applicant then goes on to explain that the limitation means that all sides of the contact hole in a top view (see fig. 2 of arguments) have a sidewall insulation film. The examiner believes that such a limitation is not supported by the specification. The example figure 2 of the applicant's arguments is not found in the spec and the specification only literally states that the sidewall insulation is formed in the contact hole on the sidewalls of the gate and etching stopper film. Based on the language of the claims, the examiner only interprets the limitation to mean that the sidewall insulation film is formed on an inner wall of the contact hole and covering the side walls of the conductor pattern (gate) and etching stopper film. For this reason, Hosotani discloses such a limitation just as the applicant admits in the arguments. The rejection is therefore still proper.

Continuation of 7. For purposes of Appeal, claim 36 will be cancelled as requested in the AF Amendment and the remaining claims will be rejected as they were in the Final Office Action.

ALLAN R. WILSON PRIMARY EXAMINER